

Indications for a preferred reference frame from an ether-drift experiment

M. Consoli and E. Costanzo

Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Catania
Dipartimento di Fisica e Astronomia dell' Università di Catania
Via Santa Sofia 64, 95123 Catania, Italy

Abstract

We present a fully model-independent analysis of the extensive observations reported by a recent ether-drift experiment in Berlin. No a priori assumption is made on the nature of a hypothetical preferred frame. We find a remarkable consistency with an Earth's cosmic motion exhibiting an average declination angle $|\gamma| \sim 43^\circ$ and with values of the RMS anisotropy parameter $(1/2 - \beta + \delta)$ that are one order of magnitude larger than the presently quoted ones. This might represent the first modern indication for a preferred frame and for a non-zero anisotropy of the speed of light.

PACS: 03.30.+p, 01.55.+b

Submitted to Physical Review Letters

The present generation of ether-drift experiments, combining the possibility of active rotations of the apparatus with the use of cryogenic optical resonators, is currently pushing the relative accuracy of the measured frequency shifts to the level $\mathcal{O}(10^{-16})$. Therefore, it becomes important that such a high precision is not obscured by model-dependent assumptions in the analysis of the data that might introduce uncontrolled errors in the determination of the physical parameters. In this Letter we'll present a fully model-independent analysis of the extensive observations reported in Ref.[1] without constraining a hypothetical preferred frame to coincide with the CMB. By removing this assumption, the data provide consistent indications for the existence of a different type of preferred frame and for an anisotropy of the two-way speed of light that is one order of magnitude larger than the presently quoted one.

The starting point for our analysis is the expression for the relative frequency shift of two orthogonal optical resonators at a given time t . This is expressed as

$$\frac{\delta\nu[\theta(t)]}{\nu_0} = S(t) \sin 2\theta(t) + C(t) \cos 2\theta(t) \quad (1)$$

where $\theta(t)$ is the angle of rotation of the apparatus. The Fourier expansion of the two amplitudes $S(t)$ and $C(t)$ is predicted to be

$$S(t) = S_{s1} \sin \tau + S_{c1} \cos \tau + S_{s2} \sin(2\tau) + S_{c2} \cos(2\tau) \quad (2)$$

$$C(t) = C_0 + C_{s1} \sin \tau + C_{c1} \cos \tau + C_{s2} \sin(2\tau) + C_{c2} \cos(2\tau) \quad (3)$$

where $\tau = \omega_{\text{sid}} t$ is the sidereal time of the observation in degrees and $\omega_{\text{sid}} \sim \frac{2\pi}{23^h 56'}$.

Introducing the colatitude of the laboratory $\chi \sim 37.5^\circ$, and the unknown average velocity, right ascension and declination of the cosmic motion with respect to a hypothetical preferred frame, (respectively v , α and γ) one finds the expressions reported in Table I of Ref. [1],

$$C_0 = -(1/2 - \beta + \delta) \frac{v^2 \sin^2 \chi}{c^2} (3 \cos 2\gamma - 1), \quad (4)$$

$$C_{s1} = \frac{1}{4} (1/2 - \beta + \delta) \frac{v^2}{c^2} \sin 2\gamma \sin \alpha \sin 2\chi, \quad (5)$$

$$C_{c1} = \frac{1}{4} (1/2 - \beta + \delta) \frac{v^2}{c^2} \sin 2\gamma \cos \alpha \sin 2\chi, \quad (6)$$

$$C_{s2} = \frac{1}{4} (1/2 - \beta + \delta) \frac{v^2}{c^2} \cos^2 \gamma \sin 2\alpha (1 + \cos^2 \chi), \quad (7)$$

$$C_{c2} = \frac{1}{4} (1/2 - \beta + \delta) \frac{v^2}{c^2} \cos^2 \gamma \cos 2\alpha (1 + \cos^2 \chi) \quad (8)$$

Table 1: The experimental data for the C -coefficients as extracted from Fig.3 of Ref.[1].

$C_{s1}[\times 10^{-16}]$	$C_{c1}[\times 10^{-16}]$	$C_{s2}[\times 10^{-16}]$	$C_{c2}[\times 10^{-16}]$
-2.7 ± 4.5	5.3 ± 4.8	-3.2 ± 4.7	1.2 ± 4.2
-18.6 ± 6.5	8.9 ± 6.4	-11.4 ± 6.5	-5.0 ± 6.4
-0.7 ± 3.9	5.3 ± 3.6	5.0 ± 3.5	1.6 ± 3.8
6.1 ± 4.6	0.0 ± 4.8	-8.1 ± 4.8	-4.0 ± 4.6
2.0 ± 8.6	1.3 ± 7.7	16.1 ± 8.0	-3.3 ± 7.2
3.0 ± 5.8	4.6 ± 5.9	8.6 ± 5.9	-6.9 ± 5.9
0.0 ± 5.4	-9.5 ± 5.7	-5.5 ± 5.6	-3.5 ± 5.4
-1.1 ± 8.1	11.0 ± 7.9	0.9 ± 8.3	18.6 ± 7.9
8.6 ± 6.5	2.7 ± 6.7	4.3 ± 6.5	-12.4 ± 6.4
-4.8 ± 4.8	-5.1 ± 4.8	3.8 ± 4.7	-5.2 ± 4.7
5.7 ± 3.2	3.0 ± 3.4	-6.3 ± 3.2	0.0 ± 3.5
4.8 ± 8.0	0.0 ± 7.0	0.0 ± 7.6	1.5 ± 7.7
3.0 ± 4.3	-5.9 ± 4.3	-2.1 ± 4.4	14.1 ± 4.3
-4.5 ± 4.4	-2.3 ± 4.5	4.1 ± 4.3	3.2 ± 4.3
0.0 ± 3.6	4.6 ± 3.4	0.6 ± 3.2	4.9 ± 3.3

where $(1/2 - \beta + \delta)$ indicates the Robertson-Mansouri-Sexl [2, 3] (RMS) anisotropy parameter. The corresponding S -quantities are also given by $S_{s1} = -C_{c1}/\cos \chi$, $S_{c1} = C_{s1}/\cos \chi$, $S_{s2} = -\frac{2 \cos \chi}{1 + \cos^2 \chi} C_{c2}$ and $S_{c2} = \frac{2 \cos \chi}{1 + \cos^2 \chi} C_{s2}$.

The experimental data reported in Ref.[1] refer to 15 short-period observations performed from December 2004 to April 2005. As suggested by the same authors, it is safer to concentrate on the observed time modulation of the signal, i.e. on the quantities $C_{s1}, C_{c1}, C_{s2}, C_{c2}$ (and on their S -counterparts). In fact, the constant components $\bar{C} = C_0$ and $\bar{S} \equiv S_0$ are most likely affected by spurious systematic effects such as thermal drift (see also the discussion in Ref. [4]).

Since the individual determinations of the various parameters for each of the 15 short-period observations were not explicitly given by the authors of Ref.[1], we have extracted these values from their Fig.3. The relevant numbers are reported in our Table 1 and Table 2.

Table 2: The experimental data for the S -coefficients as extracted from Fig. 3 of Ref.[1].

$S_{s1}[\times 10^{-16}]$	$S_{c1}[\times 10^{-16}]$	$S_{s2}[\times 10^{-16}]$	$S_{c2}[\times 10^{-16}]$
11.2 ± 4.7	11.9 ± 4.9	1.8 ± 4.9	0.8 ± 4.5
1.8 ± 6.5	-4.3 ± 6.5	6.4 ± 6.4	1.8 ± 6.4
-3.3 ± 3.8	2.9 ± 3.8	-5.9 ± 3.8	4.6 ± 4.0
12.7 ± 5.1	14.3 ± 5.5	-1.9 ± 5.3	-3.3 ± 5.1
4.7 ± 8.4	-6.9 ± 7.3	-1.8 ± 8.0	-7.8 ± 7.0
5.2 ± 5.8	-3.0 ± 5.9	7.1 ± 5.9	-5.9 ± 5.8
11.1 ± 5.3	-13.4 ± 5.4	-4.5 ± 5.5	-9.8 ± 5.5
-12.1 ± 8.9	0.0 ± 8.8	-3.1 ± 9.0	1.4 ± 8.9
-4.8 ± 6.3	6.5 ± 6.4	-8.1 ± 6.3	3.5 ± 6.5
9.8 ± 5.0	4.8 ± 5.0	1.9 ± 5.0	-9.2 ± 4.8
0.0 ± 3.2	-3.9 ± 3.6	1.0 ± 3.1	-2.2 ± 3.4
-12.7 ± 7.7	8.5 ± 6.8	-8.3 ± 7.2	-7.1 ± 7.4
-7.9 ± 4.7	-4.3 ± 4.8	-1.9 ± 4.8	-6.2 ± 4.7
16.1 ± 4.9	12.0 ± 5.2	2.9 ± 4.9	-9.6 ± 4.8
13.9 ± 3.9	-7.0 ± 3.4	-3.3 ± 3.5	3.0 ± 3.6

For our analysis, rather than using the individual C and S coefficients themselves, we shall work with the combinations

$$C_{11} \equiv \sqrt{C_{s1}^2 + C_{c1}^2} \quad (9)$$

$$C_{22} \equiv \sqrt{C_{s2}^2 + C_{c2}^2} \quad (10)$$

$$S_{11} \equiv \sqrt{S_{s1}^2 + S_{c1}^2} \quad (11)$$

$$S_{22} \equiv \sqrt{S_{s2}^2 + S_{c2}^2} \quad (12)$$

Table 3: The experimental values for the combinations of C - and S - coefficients defined in Eqs.(9)-(12) as obtained from our Table 1 and Table 2.

$C_{11}[\times 10^{-16}]$	$C_{22}[\times 10^{-16}]$	$S_{11}[\times 10^{-16}]$	$S_{22}[\times 10^{-16}]$
5.9 ± 4.7	3.5 ± 4.6	16.3 ± 4.8	2.0 ± 4.9
20.6 ± 6.4	12.5 ± 6.5	4.6 ± 6.5	6.6 ± 6.4
5.3 ± 3.6	5.3 ± 3.6	4.4 ± 3.8	7.5 ± 3.8
6.1 ± 4.6	9.0 ± 4.8	19.1 ± 5.3	3.8 ± 5.1
2.4 ± 8.4	16.5 ± 8.0	8.4 ± 7.7	8.0 ± 7.1
5.5 ± 5.9	11.0 ± 5.9	6.0 ± 5.9	9.2 ± 5.9
9.5 ± 5.7	6.5 ± 5.5	17.4 ± 5.4	10.7 ± 5.5
11.0 ± 7.9	18.7 ± 7.9	12.1 ± 8.9	3.4 ± 9.0
9.1 ± 6.5	13.1 ± 6.4	8.1 ± 6.4	8.8 ± 6.4
7.0 ± 4.8	6.5 ± 4.7	10.9 ± 5.0	9.4 ± 4.8
6.4 ± 3.1	6.3 ± 3.2	3.9 ± 3.6	2.4 ± 3.4
4.8 ± 8.0	1.5 ± 7.7	15.3 ± 7.4	10.9 ± 7.3
6.6 ± 4.3	14.3 ± 4.3	9.0 ± 4.7	6.5 ± 4.7
5.1 ± 4.5	5.2 ± 4.3	20.0 ± 5.0	10.0 ± 4.8
4.6 ± 3.4	5.0 ± 3.3	15.6 ± 3.8	4.4 ± 3.5

This is useful to reduce the model dependence in the analysis of the data. In this way, in fact, the right ascension α drops out from the theoretical predictions that will only depend on $|\gamma|$, and the overall normalization factor

$$K = |(1/2 - \beta + \delta)| \frac{v^2}{c^2} \quad (13)$$

The experimental values for these auxiliary quantities are shown in our Table 3 (for simplicity we report symmetrical errors).

Thus, we obtain the relations

$$C_{11} = \frac{1}{4}K|\sin 2\gamma|\sin 2\chi \quad (14)$$

and

$$C_{22} = \frac{1}{4}K\cos^2\gamma(1 + \cos^2\chi). \quad (15)$$

The corresponding S -coefficients are also predicted as $S_{11} = C_{11}/\cos\chi$ and $S_{22} = \frac{2\cos\chi}{1+\cos^2\chi}C_{22}$.

As one can check, the values reported in Table 3 show a good consistency. Thus we have computed the weighted averages obtaining the following results

$$\langle C_{11} \rangle = (6.7 \pm 1.2) \cdot 10^{-16} \quad \langle C_{22} \rangle = (7.6 \pm 1.2) \cdot 10^{-16} \quad (16)$$

$$\langle S_{11} \rangle = (11.0 \pm 1.3) \cdot 10^{-16} \quad \langle S_{22} \rangle = (6.3 \pm 1.3) \cdot 10^{-16} \quad (17)$$

Now, the measured ratio $\frac{\langle S_{11} \rangle}{\langle C_{11} \rangle} = 1.64 \pm 0.36$ is consistent with the theoretical prediction $1/\cos\chi \sim 1.26$ and the measured ratio $\frac{\langle S_{22} \rangle}{\langle C_{22} \rangle} = 0.83 \pm 0.21$ is consistent with the theoretical prediction $\frac{2\cos\chi}{1+\cos^2\chi} \sim 0.97$.

We can thus proceed and obtain 4 independent determinations of the average $|\gamma|$ from the 4 ratios $R_1 = \frac{\langle C_{11} \rangle}{\langle C_{22} \rangle}$, $R_2 = \frac{\langle C_{11} \rangle}{\langle S_{22} \rangle}$, $R_3 = \frac{\langle S_{11} \rangle}{\langle S_{22} \rangle}$, $R_4 = \frac{\langle S_{11} \rangle}{\langle C_{22} \rangle}$. The results are the following (for simplicity we report symmetrical errors): 1) from R_1 one gets $|\gamma| = 36^\circ \pm 7^\circ$, 2) from R_2 one gets $|\gamma| = 41^\circ \pm 8^\circ$, 3) from R_3 one gets $|\gamma| = 49^\circ \pm 7^\circ$, 4) from R_4 one gets $|\gamma| = 44^\circ \pm 6^\circ$. As one can see, all data are well consistent with an average value

$$|\gamma| \sim 43^\circ \pm 3^\circ \quad (18)$$

After having determined the value of the average declination, we can finally fix $|\gamma| \sim 43^\circ$ everywhere and obtain 4 estimates of the overall normalization factor K . The results are the following: 1) from $\langle C_{11} \rangle$ one gets $K = (28 \pm 5) \cdot 10^{-16}$, 2) from $\langle C_{22} \rangle$ one gets $K = (35 \pm 6) \cdot 10^{-16}$, 3) from $\langle S_{11} \rangle$ one gets $K = (36 \pm 4) \cdot 10^{-16}$, 4) from $\langle S_{22} \rangle$ one gets $K = (30 \pm 6) \cdot 10^{-16}$. As one can see, all data are well consistent with an average value

$$K \sim (33 \pm 3) \cdot 10^{-16} \quad (19)$$

Notice the huge difference with respect to the analysis of Ref.[1] where the Earth's motion with respect to the CMB ($v \sim 370$ km/s, $\alpha \sim 168^\circ$, $\gamma \sim -6^\circ$) was assumed from the very beginning in the analysis of the data. In this case, fixing $v \sim 370$ km/s and taking the value of the RMS parameter from Ref.[1] $|(1/2 - \beta + \delta)| \sim (2 \pm 2) \cdot 10^{-10}$, one would rather predict

the value $K \sim (3 \pm 3) \cdot 10^{-16}$ which is one order of magnitude smaller than the value reported in our Eq.(19). Equivalently, assuming tentatively the range of velocities $230 \text{ km/s} \leq v \leq 370 \text{ km/s}$, to account for most cosmic motions of the Solar System (within the Galaxy, relatively to the centroid of the Local Group, relatively to the CMB,...) our result Eq.(19) implies a RMS parameter

$$20 \cdot 10^{-10} \leq |(1/2 - \beta + \delta)| \leq 60 \cdot 10^{-10} \quad (20)$$

To push further the analysis, one might attempt to use the above results to constrain the average value of the right ascension α from the individual average values of the C - and S - coefficients reported in Ref.[1]. However, this is not possible at the present. In fact, in order to consider the individual coefficients one should fix the sign of the declination angle (i.e. $\gamma = \pm 43^\circ$) and the sign of the RMS anisotropy parameter. These have to be combined with the 4 possible choices of α ($\sin \alpha = \pm |\sin \alpha|$ and $\cos \alpha = \pm |\cos \alpha|$). The 16 different alternatives cannot be fully exploited since, at the present, among the 8 average values of the C - and S - coefficients reported in Ref.[1], only $\langle S_{s1} \rangle$ and $\langle S_{c2} \rangle$ are non-zero beyond the one-sigma level.

Summarizing: we have presented a fully model-independent analysis of the extensive ether-drift observations reported in Ref.[1]. Without constraining a hypothetical preferred frame to coincide with the CMB, the experimental data select a definite (absolute) value of the average declination angle $|\gamma| \sim 43^\circ$ and a RMS parameter lying in the typical range $20 \cdot 10^{-10} \leq |(1/2 - \beta + \delta)| \leq 60 \cdot 10^{-10}$. This might represent the first modern indication for the existence of a preferred reference frame and for a non-zero anisotropy of the speed of light. At the same time, since this range we have found for the RMS parameter is consistent with the theoretical prediction $\sim 42 \cdot 10^{-10}$ of Refs.[5, 6], we emphasize once more the importance of a fully model-independent analysis of the data.

References

- [1] S. Herrmann, A. Senger, E. Kovalchuk, H. Müller and A. Peters, arXiv:physics/0508097, to appear in Phys. Rev. Letters
- [2] H. P. Robertson, Rev. Mod. Phys. **21**, 378 (1949).
- [3] R. M. Mansouri and R. U. Sexl, Gen. Rel. Grav. **8**, 497 (1977).
- [4] P. Antonini, M. Okhapkin, E. Göklü and S. Schiller, Phys. Rev. **A71**, 050101(R) (2005) [arXiv:gr-qc/0504109].
- [5] M. Consoli, A. Pagano and L. Pappalardo, Phys. Lett. **A318**, 292 (2003).
- [6] M. Consoli and E. Costanzo, Phys. Lett. **A333**, 355 (2004).